

PR



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,888	09/20/2000	Chris Connaughton	2100226-991100	6813

30074 7590 01/02/2004

TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP
SUITE 1800
425 WALNUT STREET
CINCINNATI, OH 45202-3957

EXAMINER

SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

6

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/665,888	CONNAUGHTON, CHRIS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gautam Sain	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1) The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

1-1) Claims 1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10,12,13,14,15,16,17,19,20 and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Aoyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,726, issued Sep. 21, 1999).

In regard to independent claim 1, Aoyama teaches “detecting groups of characters in the left and right files” (ie., method and apparatus for extracting a difference character string between structured documents... comparison and discrimination of the logical structures of structured documents) (col 3, lines 17-29).

Aoyama teaches “comparing a group in the right file to a corresponding group in the left file to identify a modified group wherein some portion of the group is different between the left file and the right file” (ie., method and apparatus for managing the editing of a structured document... on the basis of comparison and discrimination of the logical structures of structured documents) (col 3, lines 23-28).

Aoyama teaches “generating a comparison result file containing the modified groups as sections of the comparison result file to maintain the formatting of the modified groups when placed in the comparison result file” (ie., system displays the resulting difference on the terminal device and stores the difference data in a secondary

memory unit) (col 13, lines 56-60; col 8, line 50 – col 9, line 5; Fig 11B shows the difference between two documents, maintaining the formatting of the modified groups fig 3A and 3B comparison).

In regard to dependent claim 2, Aoyama teaches “detecting the groups in the files further comprises detecting and distinguishing tags in the files to determine the groups in the files” (ie., allocating tags for identification, in order to compare the text string that lies between the tags) (col 7, lines 25-35; col 8, lines 10-15).

In regard to dependent claim 3, Aoyama teaches “the files are HTML files and the tags are HTML tags” (ie., SGML, HTML structured documents, tags) (col 1, lines 50-60; col 6, lines 49-53).

In regard to dependent claim 4, Aoyama teaches “displaying the comparison result file to a user so that the user views the changes portions of the right file with the formatting intact” (ie., system displays the resulting difference on the terminal device and stores the difference data in a secondary memory unit) (col 13, lines 56-60; col 8, line 50 – col 9, line 5; Fig 11B shows the difference between two documents, maintaining the formatting of the modified groups fig 3A and 3B comparison).

In regard to dependent claim 5, Aoyama teaches “detecting the groups further comprises normalizing the right file and left file based on one or more rules in a rules database to permit line-by-line comparison of the right and left file despite the formatting in the files” (ie., comparison criterion is set in advance and stored in a criterion table for extraction of difference in character strings) (col 4, lines 50-58; col 6, lines 40-48).

In regard to dependent claim 6, Aoyama teaches “one or more rules for handling special elements in the files that would inhibit the line-by-line comparison of the file” (ie., parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison) (col 3, lines 62-col 4, line 2; col 7, lines 20-44).

In regard to dependent claim 8, Aoyama teaches “comparing the right file to the left file on a line-by-line basis wherein block level HTML elements in each file are treated as separate lines during the comparison” (ie., allocate the character strings sandwiched between a start and an end tag) (col 7, lines 27-30).

In regard to dependent claim 9, Aoyama teaches “normalizing further comprises processing each character of the right and left files” (ie., document tree which parses a structured document into nodes, then processes each node by comparing characters of the nodes) (col 3, 63 – col 4, lines 2).

In regard to dependent claim 10, Aoyama teaches “detecting a preformatting start tag when scanning the document and skipping the pre-formatted text contained between the start tag and a preformatting end tag” (ie., identity tags and ignoring tags and the character strings sandwiched between the ignoring tags) (col 3, lines 50-60; col 7, lines 20-45).

In regard to independent claim 12, Aoyama teaches “detecting groups of characters in the left and right files” (ie., method and apparatus for extracting a difference character string between structured documents... comparison and discrimination of the logical structures of structured documents) (col 3, lines 17-29).

Aoyama teaches “comparing a group in the right file to a corresponding group in the left file to identify a modified group wherein some portion of the group is different between the left file and the right file” (ie., method and apparatus for managing the editing of a structured document... on the basis of comparison and discrimination of the logical structures of structured documents) (col 3, lines 23-28).

Aoyama teaches “generating a comparison result file containing the modified groups as sections of the comparison result file to maintain the formatting of the modified groups when placed in the comparison result file” (ie., system displays the resulting difference on the terminal device and stores the difference data in a secondary memory unit) (col 13, lines 56-60; col 8, line 50 – col 9, line 5; Fig 11B shows the difference between two documents, maintaining the formatting of the modified groups fig 3A and 3B comparison).

In regard to dependent claim 13, Aoyama teaches “means for detecting and distinguishing tags in the files to determine the groups in the files” (ie., allocating tags for identification, in order to compare the text string that lies between the tags) (col 7, lines 25-35; col 8, lines 10-15).

In regard to dependent claim 14, Aoyama teaches “the files are HTML files and the tags are HTML tags” (ie., SGML, HTML structured documents, tags) (col 1, lines 50-60; col 6, lines 49-53).

In regard to dependent claim 15, Aoyama teaches “displaying the comparison result file to a user so that the user views the changes portions of the right file with the formatting intact” (ie., system displays the resulting difference on the terminal device

and stores the difference data in a secondary memory unit) (col 13, lines 56-60; col 8, line 50 – col 9, line 5; Fig 11B shows the difference between two documents, maintaining the formatting of the modified groups fig 3A and 3B comparison).

In regard to dependent claim 16, Aoyama teaches “a normalizer for processing the right file and left file based on one or more rules in a rules database to permit line-by-line comparison of the right and left file despite the formatting in the files” (ie., comparison criterion is set in advance and stored in a criterion table for extraction of difference in character strings) (col 4, lines 50-58; col 6, lines 40-48).

In regard to dependent claim 17, Aoyama teaches “one or more rules for handling special elements in the files that would inhibit the line-by-line comparison of the file” (ie., parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison) (col 3, lines 62-col 4, line 2; col 7, lines 20-44).

In regard to dependent claim 19, Aoyama teaches “comparing the right file to the left file on a line-by-line basis wherein each block in each file is treated as a line during the comparison” (ie., allocate the character strings sandwiched between a start and an end tag) (col 7, lines 27-30).

In regard to dependent claim 20, Aoyama teaches “normalizing further comprises processing each character of the right and left files” (ie., document tree which parses a structured document into nodes, then processes each node by comparing characters of the nodes) (col 3, 63 – col 4, lines 2).

In regard to dependent claim 21, Aoyama teaches “detecting a preformatting start tag when scanning the document and means for skipping the pre-formatted text contained between the start tag and a preformatting end tag” (ie., identity tags and ignoring tags and the character strings sandwiched between the ignoring tags) (col 3, lines 50-60; col 7, lines 20-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2-1) Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoyama, as applied to claims 1, 5, 6 and 12, 16, 17, in view of Blumer et al. (U.S. Patent 5,890,171, issued Mar. 30, 1999).

In regard to independent claim 7, Aoyama does not teach converting relative URLs into absolute URLs in the file. However, Blumer teaches “converting relative URLs into absolute URL in the file” (ie., a program that converts relative URL to an absolute URL) (col 8, lines 44-48; col 11, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Aoyama with Blumers to include converting relative URLs into absolute URL with the motivation to provide an improved computer system and computer-implemented method for interpreting hypertext links in a document when including the document within another document (Blumer, Title).

In regard to dependent claim 18, Aoyama does not teach converting relative URLs into absolute URLs in the file. However, Blumer teaches “converting relative URLs into absolute URL in the file” (ie., a program that converts relative URL to an absolute URL) (col 8, lines 44-48; col 11, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Aoyama with Blumers to include converting relative URLs into absolute URL with the motivation to provide an improved computer system and computer-implemented method for interpreting hypertext links in a document when including the document within another document (Blumer, Title).

Aoyama teachings are described above in paragraph 1-1.

2-2) Claims 11 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoyama, as applied to claim 1, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 12, 16, 20, 21, in view of Quint et al (US Patent No 5,021,995, issued Jun. 4, 1991).

In regard to dependent claim 11, Aoyama does not teach character processing with removing carriage return. However Quint teaches “removing carriage returns” (ie., sequence of ASCII record is delimited by a carriage, which are removed) (col 17, lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Aoyama with Quint to include removing carriage returns when processing characters with the motivation to provide for better organization of file structure and characters prior to comparing (see Quint, col 1, lines 10-35).

In regard to dependent claim 22, Aoyama does not teach character processing with removing carriage return. However Quint teaches "removing carriage returns" (ie., sequence of ASCII record is delimited by a carriage, which are removed) (col 17, lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Aoyama with Quint to include removing carriage returns when processing characters with the motivation to provide for better organization of file structure and characters prior to comparing (see Quint, col 1, lines 10-35).

Aoyama teachings are described above in paragraph 1-1.

Other Prior Art Made of Record

- 3) A. Sliger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6216175 B1, issued Apr. 10, 2001).
- B. Tanimura (U.S. Patent No. 5752039, issued May 12, 1998).
- C. Gormish (U.S. Patent No. 6298358, issued Oct. 2, 2001).
- D. Egger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6233571, issued may 15, 2001).
- E. Apte (U.S. Patent No. 6298353 B1, issued Oct 2, 2001).
- F. Aoyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6098071, issued Aug. 1, 2000).

Art Unit: 2176

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 703-305-8777. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703)305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.



Gautam Sain
Patent Examiner
Tech Center 2100


JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER